### HIGHER EDUCATION UPDATE

NUMBER UP/00-1 FEBRUARY 2000



News from the

# CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr., ChairAlan Arkatov, Vice Chair Jacqueline A. Benjamin Carol Chandler Ward Connerly Darren Guerra Lance Izumi Kyo "Paul" Jhin Monica Lozano Jeff Marston Ralph R. Pesqueira Andrea L. Rich Roger Schrimp Khyl Smeby Howard Welinsky Melinda G. Wilson

Warren H. Fox *Executive Director* 

1303 J Street, Suite 500 Sacramento, California 95814-2938 Telephone (916) 445-7933 (Voice) FAX Number (916) 327-4417

## Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2000-01

EACH YEAR, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) submit to the Commission information on faculty salaries for their respective institutions and for a set of comparison colleges and universities located primarily outside of California. On the basis of this information, Commission staff develops estimates of the percentage changes in faculty salaries in California public universities that would be required to attain parity with the respective comparison groups in the forthcoming fiscal year. Preliminary parity figures for both systems are reported to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst during December. A preliminary report on this information is sent to the Commission in February, with a more detailed report produced in April.

This report provides preliminary estimates of faculty salary compensation information for the current (1999-2000) and budget (2000-01) fiscal years. It also contains a brief description of the methodology employed to calculate the parity percentages and the faculty salary increase trends over the last 21 years.

#### A brief summary of the methodology

The faculty salary methodology includes two separate comparison institution groups -- one each for the CSU and the UC. The procedures by which the systems collect data, and the techniques used to analyze those data have been designed and refined periodically by the Commission in consultation with the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. The Committee includes representatives from the State University, the University of California, the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and other interested parties. As a result, the faculty salary methodology is reflective of several compromises among interested parties rather than the vision of any single individual or agency. This year's methodology is unchanged from the last several years, and can be found in the Commission's 1997 faculty salary report (CPEC Report No. 97-2, 1997). Supplemental Budget Language adopted by the Legislature in 1998 precludes changes in the methodology prior to the 2002-03 budget cycle.

The methodology consists of two primary elements: (1) collecting salary data from the comparison institutions; and (2) a computational process that involves the weighting of several data elements by various factors, such as the number of faculty at each rank.

The comparison institutions for the two university systems are shown in Display 1. Each list is formulated through extensive discussions and compromises by the Faculty Salary Advisory Committee members. Both lists have changed numerous times in the last 20 years.

The computational process includes a determination of current average salaries, by rank, in both the California systems and the comparison institutions, with each rank's average projected forward one year based on a five-year

DISPLAY 1 Faculty Salary Comparison Institutions for the California State University and the University of California

#### The California State University

Northeast Region

Bucknell University\*

Rutgers, the State University of

New Jersey, Newark

State University of New York,

Albany

Tufts University\*

University of Connecticut

Southern Region
Georgia State University
George Mason University
North Carolina State University
University of Maryland,
Baltimore County

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

North Central Region

Cleveland State University
Illinois State University
Loyola University, Chicago\*
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin,
Milwaukee

Western Region

Arizona State University
Reed College\*
University of Colorado, Denver
University of Nevada, Reno
University of Southern California\*
University of Texas, Arlington

#### **University of California**

Harvard University\*
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology\*
Stanford University\*
State University of New York,
Buffalo
University of Illinois, Urbana
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Virginia, Charlottesville
Yale University\*

creases going to UC faculty. This reduced the University's parity gap projected last year to a lag of 2.9 percent, and the projected lag to 3.0 percent for 2000-

DISPLAY 2 Comparison of Faculty Salary Parity Figures, with Actual Percentage Increases Provided, 1980-81 Through 2000-01

	The California	State Univers	ity University	of California
Year	Parity Figure	Salary Increase	Parity Figure	Salary Increase
·		<u></u>		
1980-81	0.8%	9.8%	5.0%	9.8%
1981-82	0.5	6.0	5.8	6.0
1982-83	2.3	0.0	9.8	0.0
1983-84	9.2	6.0	18.5	7.0
1984-85	7.6	10.0	10.6	9.0
1985-86	N/A	10.5	6.5	9.5
1986-87	6.9	6.8	1.4	5.0
1987-88	6.9	6.9	2.0	5.6
1988-89	4.7	4.7	3.0	3.0
1989-90	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
1990-91	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
1991-92	4.1	0.0	3.5	0.0
1992-93	6.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
1993-94	8.5	3.0	6.5	0.0
1994-95	6.8	0.0	12.6	3.0
1995-96	12.7	2.5	10.4	3.0
1996-97	9.6	4.0	10.3	5.0
1997-98	10.8	4.0	6.7	5.0
1998-99	11.2	5.7	4.6	4.5
1999-00	11.1	6.0	2.9	2.9
2000-01	8.9	N/A	3.0	N/A

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

historical compounded growth rate. The projected 2000-01 average rank-by-rank salaries for the respective comparison institutions are then compared to the current-year averages for the State University and University. These individual averages are then combined into an "All Ranks Average" for each respective comparison group and California system, and is then compared for the current and budget years. Comparing the average projected for each comparison group in the next year with the current-year average for the respective California system produces a budget-year "parity figure" for each system.

#### Faculty salary trends

The Commission's salary computations for each of the two university systems since the 1980-81 fiscal year plus the actual amounts granted are in Display 2.

During the early-to-mid 1980s, the faculty salary gap for the CSU was consistently narrower than that for the University. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. In the major economic recession in California during first half of the 1990s, little in faculty salary increases were funded in State budgets. This widened the compensation gap between faculty at California's institutions and those at institutions to which they are compared to its highest levels since the hyper-inflationary days of the late 1970s.

California's recovery from the severe recession of the early 1990s helped faculty to again receive percentage salary increases in varying amounts, with slightly larger in-

<sup>\*</sup> Independent Institution.

01 fiscal year. At the State University, where faculty earlier this year received a salary increase of 6.0 percent, the lag has lessened from 11.1 percent projected last year for the 1999-00 fiscal year to a projection of 8.9 percent in the upcoming 2000-01 fiscal year.

It is important to use these figures correctly. In a given cycle, a projection of a possible future faculty lag for UC/CSU is made, based on observed trends over a five-year period, with the assumption that UC/CSU salaries will not increase at all in the projected fiscal year. Once a budget cycle for that projected year has been completed --which may or may not include a salary increase, a figure can be computed to reflect an actual lag, if any. The process begins again with the next budget cycle and a new projected parity figure.

In the next section, the Commission reports both a new projected parity figure for CSU and UC in the 2000-01 fiscal year, and an actual figure for the current 1999-2000 fiscal year. These are shown in Displays 3 and 6 for CSU and UC, respectively.

#### The parity figures for 2000-01

California State University

The parity figure for the State University system in 2000-01 is estimated to be 8.9 percent -- the percentage by which average salaries in the State University would have to increase to equal the average salaries projected to be paid by the comparison institutions in 2000-01. Average salaries in the current 1999-2000 fiscal year are about 5.2 percent below those currently paid by the comparison group (see Display 3). These calculations are based upon actual information received from all 20 of the State University's comparison institutions.

Displays 4 and 5 show rank-by-rank and institution-byinstitution salaries for both the State University and the comparison group in 1994-95 and 1999-00. These data are used to determine the five-year compounded average that permits current-year salaries to be projected into the budget year. The shaded lines in both displays indicate the State University's relative position overall to the entire list. The data indicate a slight increase in the State University's position from ninth place in 1994-95 to eighth place in 1999-00. For the current year, faculty at each individual rank (except for the few remaining instructors) all fall well below the median, ranging from 11<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> place. However, the State University's overall average is as high as eighth because of the fact that the State University has nearly 58 percent of its faculty at the full professor rank, while the comparison institutions as a group have, on average, only 38 percent at that rank.

#### University of California

The parity figure projection in 2000-01 for the University system, is 3.0 percent (see Display 6). The display also indicates that University average salaries are actually ahead of the comparison group by almost one percent in the current (1999-00) fiscal year.

Display 7 presents 1994-95 and 1999-00 comparison institution data, by rank, and indicates that the University has maintained its median position of fifth over this five-year period. There is no change from last year in the public/independent relationship, relative to faculty salaries -- that is, all of the independent institutions pay more than any of the public institutions.

The University's position relative to its comparison institutions is more consistent than it is with the CSU. For example, where in the current year the University's allranks average is at the median of the nine institutions listed, it is also fifth for full professors, fifth for associate professors, and fourth for assistant professors. By contrast, the State University's all ranks average is eighth in the current year, but 15th for full professors and 11th for associate and assistant professors. The consistency at UC occurs because the distribution of faculty at each professorial rank in that system is rather similar to the distribution of faculty in its eight comparison institutions. That similarity is not as evident in the State University distribution, since a higher percentage have been awarded full professor appointments.

DISPLAY 3 California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1994-95 and 1999-00; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2000-01; and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2000-01

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1994-95 <sup>1</sup>	Average	son Group Salaries -2000 <sup>1</sup>	Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group Projected Salaries 2000-01
Professor	\$71,089	\$85.	,905	3.9%	\$89,220
Associate Professor	\$52,581	\$62,	,077	3.4%	\$64,173
Assistant Professor	\$43,224	\$50,	,904	3.3%	\$52,596
Instructor	\$34,533	\$37,	,392	1.6%	\$37,991
	California State University Actual	Average	son Group Salaries	California State Salaries to Equ <u>Institut</u>	crease Required in University Average all the Comparison ion Average
Academic Rank	Average Salaries 1999-00 <sup>3</sup>	Actual <u>1999-00</u>	Projected 2000-01	Actual <u>1999-00</u>	Projected <b>2000-01</b>
Professor	\$75,950	\$85,905	\$89,220	13.1%	17.5%
Associate Professor	\$60,717	\$62,077	\$64,173	2.2%	5.7%
Assistant Professor	\$49,181	\$50,904	\$52,596	3.5%	6.9%
Instructor	\$38,403	\$37,392	\$37,991	-2.6%	-1.1%
Weighted by State University Staffing	\$66,281	\$72,605	\$75,266	9.5%	13.6%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$62,843	\$67,476	\$69,880	7.4%	11.2%
All Ranks Average and Net Percentage Amount <sup>2</sup>	\$65,421	\$68,758	\$71,227	5.1%	8.9%
Institutional Current-Year Staffing Pattern (Headcount Faculty)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	<u>Total</u>
California State University  Percent	6,324 57.9%	1,897 <i>17.4%</i>	2,305 21.1%	401 3.7%	10,927
Comparison Institutions Percent	4,828 38.1%	4,258 33.6%	3,118 24.6%	476 3.8%	12,680

<sup>1.</sup> Weighted 58% high-cost institutions, 42% low-cost institutions.

Source: CPEC staff analysis, March 1, 2000.

<sup>2. &</sup>quot;All-Ranks Average" salaries are derived by weighting the State University and Comparison Institutions by 75 % of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the comparison institution's staffing pattern.

<sup>3.</sup> The salary estimates for the end of 1999-2000 are projected as being 11.4% above Fall 1998 (not 1999) average salaries at each rank.

DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1994-95

Institution	<u>Р</u> No.	rofessors Avera Salary (r	_	Associate Professors Average No. Salary (rank)		Assistant Professors Average No. Salary (rank)			Instructors Average No. Salary (rank)			Total	Weighted Salary (r		
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	109	\$90,773	(1)	122	\$67,222	(1)	81	\$53,168	(1)	19	\$39,158	(5)	331	\$69,927	(1)
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	482	80,688	(2)	360	58,244	(4)	269	49,142	(2)	32	42,155	(2)	1,143	65,116	(2)
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	456	74,800	(7)	325	58,900	(3)	237	46,400	(3)	10	40,000	(4)	1,028	62,887	(3)
Institution N	267	76,149	(4)	207	54,274	(6)	113	42,437	(10)	0	1		587	61,945	(4)
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	95	76,136	(5)	118	56,093	(5)	65	43,092	(6)	0	1		278	59,902	(5)
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	207	77,674	(3)	262	53,941	(7)	138	42,049	(12)	43	36,193	(8)	650	57,800	(6)
CSU	6,706	\$62,293	(17)	2,032	\$49,979	(12)	1,520	\$40,854	(16)	150	\$32,734	(11)	10,408	\$56,332	(9)
Institution K	455	69,824	(8)	340	50,505	(10)	228	42,519	(9)	26	31,944	(13)	1,049	56,689	(7)
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	150	75,100	(6)	207	53,400	(8)	147	42,800	(7)	5	38,900	(6)	509	56,591	(8)
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	276	67,858	(12)	257	53,707	(2)	210	43,673	(5)	15	42,579	(1)	758	55,860	(10)
Institution A	577	64,688	(14)	452	48,831	(14)	251	41,359	(14)	5	32,163	(12)	1,285	54,427	(11)
Institution C	81	68,331	(10)	85	51,748	(9)	78	42,429	(11)	1	35,080	(9)	245	54,196	(12)
Institution T	272	64,221	(15)	312	50,458	(11)	163	44,139	(4)	5	36,597	(7)	752	53,974	(13)
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	138	66,181	(13)	127	48,671	(15)	94	39,590	(17)	2	42,105	(3)	361	52,964	(14)
Institution F	239	69,639	(9)	244	48,972	(13)	232	41,592	(13)	39	31,556	(14)	754	52,351	(15)
Institution L	47	60,418	(18)	19	46,208	(19)	34	39,118	(18)	0	1		100	50,476	(16)
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	93	67,899	(11)	124	47,562	(16)	99	41,325	(15)	38	29,767	(16)	354	49,250	(17)
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	102	63,210	(16)	114	47,277	(17)	118	42,707	(8)	40	33,476	(10)	374	48,704	(18)
Institution O	217	59,343	(20)	222	43,975	(21)	137	36,556	(21)	0	1		576	48,000	(19)
Institution D	143	60,108	(19)	195	46,331	(18)	119	39,025	(19)	21	31,055	(15)	478	47,963	(20)
Institution H	289	57,300	(21)	191	45,000	(20)	234	38,600	(20)	0	1		714	47,881	(21)
Totals	4,695	\$69,870		4,283	\$51,886		3,047	\$42,823		301	\$34,980		12,326	\$56,083	
High cost 10	2,108	\$74,998		2,016	\$55,252		1,458	\$44,884		204	\$36,455		5,786	\$59,171	
Low cost 10	2,587	65,692		2,267	48,892		1,589	40,931		97	31,879		6,540	53,351	
Total	4,695	\$70,345		4,283	\$52,072		3,047	\$42,907		301	\$34,167		12,326	\$56,261	

<sup>1.</sup> Universities located in higher cost areas.

NOTE: Data reported for all institutions.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1999-2000

	Professors			Associ	ate Profes		Assistant Professors			<u>I</u> 1	nstructors				
Institution	No.	Average Salary (r	_	No.	Averag Salary (r	_	No.	Averag		No.	Averag Salary (r	_	Total	Weighted Salary (r	
Institution J <sup>1</sup>	137	\$106,128		118	\$78,084		95	\$60,886		21	\$42,799	(5)	371	\$82,039	(1)
Institution Q <sup>1</sup>	502	97,531	(2)	337	68,569	(3)	226	60,141	(2)	48	48,309	(1)	1,113	79,047	(2)
Institution B <sup>1</sup>	473	93,646	(5)	334	68,947	(2)	264	54,001	(4)	13	47,607	(2)	1,084	75,828	(3)
Institution P <sup>1</sup>	124	88,608	(6)	120	65,061	(5)	64	48,751	(13)	0	1		308	71,152	(4)
Institution K	462	84,742	(7)	345	62,155	(8)	225	52,345	(3)	19	33,599	(7)	1,051	69,467	(5)
Institution R <sup>1</sup>	236	95,038	(4)	251	65,653	(4)	168	50,443	(9)	79	42,537	(6)	734	69,132	(6)
Institution N	243	82,930	(10)	189	59,575	(13)	81	49,173	(12)	0	1		513	68,995	(7)
CSU	6,324	\$75,950	(15)	1,897	\$60,717	(11)	2,305	\$49,181	(11)	401	\$38,403	(9)	10,927	\$66,281	(8)
Institution M <sup>1</sup>	165	84,210	(8)	134	60,738	(10)	102	49,202	(6)	4	34,566	(12)	405	67,137	(9)
Institution A	604	81,761	(11)	447	59,903	(12)	285	50,594	(8)	45	32,340	(14)	1,381	66,644	(10)
Institution S <sup>1</sup>	270	83,036	(9)	248	62,711	(6)	220	49,465	(7)	24	45,558	(3)	762	65,548	(11)
Institution F	195	95,135	(3)	275	62,605	(7)	287	52,096	(5)	102	30,378	(17)	859	62,652	(12)
Institution T	267	73,458	(18)	280	57,702	(15)	151	49,711	(10)	4	35,399	(8)	702	61,849	(13)
Institution G <sup>1</sup>	144	79,994	(14)	235	58,084	(14)	115	48,598	(14)	0	1		494	62,262	(14)
Institution C	78	80,739	(12)	102	61,020	(9)	96	47,132	(18)	4	43,078	(4)	280	61,495	(15)
Institution L	50	74,776	(16)	28	54,944	(18)	33	45,832	(19)	0	0		111	61,168	(16)
Institution I <sup>1</sup>	116	80,506	(13)	127	57,265	(16)	103	48,316	(15)	21	36,266	(10)	367	60,898	(17)
Institution O	219	73,448	(19)	178	53,063	(20)	121	47,171	(17)	4	32,205	(15)	522	60,090	(18)
Institution D	163	69,486	(20)	191	54,094	(19)	106	43,214	(21)	6	33,148	(13)	466	56,733	(19)
Institution E <sup>1</sup>	115	74,384	(17)	121	55,206	(17)	112	47,774	(16)	69	34,641	(11)	417	55,096	(20)
Institution H	265	66,492	(21)	198	51,867	(21)	264	43,424	(20)	13	31,762	(16)	740	53,739	(21)
Totals	4,828	\$84,684		4,258	\$61,435		3,118	\$50,504		476	\$37,452		12,680	\$66,699	
High acet 10	2 202	\$00.692		2.025	\$64.657		1 460	\$50.446		270	\$41.507		6.055	\$70.426	
High cost 10 Low cost 10	2,282 2,546	\$90,682 79,308		2,025 2,233	\$64,657 58,514		1,469 1,649	\$52,446 48,773		279 197	\$41,507 31,709		6,055 6,625	\$70,436 63,284	
Total	4,828	•	•	4,258		•	-	\$50,610			\$36,608		12,680		•

<sup>1.</sup> Universities located in higher cost areas.

NOTE: Data reported for all institutions.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

DISPLAY 6 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1994-95 and 1999-00; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1999-00; and Projected UC Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2000-01

	Compariso Average	-	Comment I Date	<b>C</b>				
Academic Rank	1994-95 <sup>1</sup>	1999-00 <sup>1</sup>	Compound Rate of Increase	-	son Group laries, 2000-01			
Professor	\$86,260	\$105,202	4.1%	\$109,463				
Associate Professor	\$58,329	\$69,786	3.7%	\$72	,334			
Assistant Professor	\$48,287	\$58,508	3.9%	\$60	,798			
	University of Calif. Average Salaries,	-	ison Group <u>e Salaries</u> Projected	University A Equal the	ase Required in vg. Salaries to Comparison n Average Projected			
Academic Rank	<u>1999-2000</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	2000-01	<u>1999-00</u>	2000-01			
Professor	\$103,099	\$105,202	\$109,463	2.0%	6.2%			
Associate Professor	\$68,758	\$69,786	\$72,334	1.5%	5.2%			
Assistant Professor	\$59,991	\$58,508	\$60,798	-2.5%	1.3%			
Weighted by University of California Staffing	\$88,898	\$90,196	\$93,777	1.5%	5.5%			
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$85,051	\$86,052	\$89,456	1.2%	5.2%			
All Ranks Average and Net Percentage Amount <sup>2</sup>	\$87,936	\$87,088	\$90,536	-1.0%	3.0%			
Institutional Budget-Year S (Full-Time-Equivalent	_	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total			
University of California		3,651.5	1,227.8	938.4	5,817.7			
Percent		62.8%	21.1%	16.1%	100.0%			
Comparison Institutions		4,329.7	1,812.7	1,939.7	8,082.1			
Percent		53.6%	22.4%	24.0%	100.0%			

<sup>1.</sup> Weighted 50% public comparison institutions, 50% independent comparison institutions.

Source: CPEC staff analysis, March 11, 2000.

<sup>2.</sup> All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University and Comparison Institutions by 75 percent of their own staffing pattern and 25 percent of the other's staffing pattern.

<sup>3.</sup> The University of California Office of the President reports that it has final survey results from seven of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the eighth institution.

DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries and Ranking, 1994-95 and 1999-2000

<u>1994-95</u>	Type <sup>1</sup>	Pro Number	ofessor Salary	Rank	<u>Associat</u> Number	e Professor Salary	Rank	<u>Assistan</u> Number	t Professor Salary	Rank	<u>Tota</u> Number	al Faculty Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	563	\$104,684	1	127	\$64,053	3	197	\$54,785	1	887	\$87,784	1
Institution A	I	480	\$98,489	2	130	\$66,648	1	154	\$53,806	2	764	\$84,064	2
Institution F	I	581	\$93,202	3	159	\$65,890	2	175	\$52,532	3	915	\$80,678	3
Institution D	I	356	\$92,168	4	119	\$54,850	6	173	\$46,480	5	648	\$73,117	4
Univ. of Calif.	P	2,991	\$79,383	5	1,142	\$53,309	7	968	\$46,185	6	5,101	\$67,246	5
Institution E	P	692	\$79,019	6	336	\$59,085	4	351	\$47,320	4	1,379	\$66,094	6
Institution C	P	325	\$78,561	7	260	\$55,083	5	164	\$44,067	7	749	\$62,876	7
Institution G	P	872	\$71,229	9	507	\$50,878	8	381	\$43,904	8	1,761	\$59,451	8
Institution B	P	425	\$73,239	8	292	\$50,102	9	197	\$41,678	9	914	\$59,050	9
Totals		4,294.9	\$85,379		1,930.0	\$56,167		1,791.8	\$47,482		8,016.7	\$69,876	
1999-00	lype <sup>1</sup>		ofessor Salary	Rank		e Professor Salary	Rank		t Professor Salary	Rank		al Faculty Salary	Rank
<i>1999-00</i> Institution H	I Type <sup>1</sup>	Pro Number 638	ofessor Salary \$124,260	1 Rank	Associat Number	e Professor Salary \$70,524	Rank	Assistan Number 218	Salary \$65,691	2 Rank	Tota Number 969	Salary \$104,817	Rank
		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary	
Institution H	I	Number 638	<b>Salary</b> \$124,260	1	Number 113	<b>Salary</b> \$70,524	3	Number 218	<b>Salary</b> \$65,691	2	Number 969	<b>Salary</b> \$104,817	1
Institution H Institution A	I I	638 512	\$124,260 \$115,966	1 2	Number 113 136	\$70,524 \$78,833	3	Number 218 200	\$65,691 \$64,524	2	969 848	\$104,817 \$97,878	1 2
Institution H Institution A Institution F	I I I	638 512 548	\$124,260 \$115,966 \$112,349	1 2 3	Number 113 136 175	\$70,524 \$78,833 \$75,019	3 1 2	218 200 166	\$65,691 \$64,524 \$66,226	2 3 1	969 848 889	\$104,817 \$97,878 \$96,388	1 2 3
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D	I I I	Number       638       512       548       386	\$124,260 \$115,966 \$112,349 \$111,897	1 2 3 4	Number 113 136 175 81	\$70,524 \$78,833 \$75,019 \$66,810	3 1 2 7	Number 218 200 166 180	\$65,691 \$64,524 \$66,226 \$54,830	2 3 1 6	Number 969 848 889 647	\$104,817 \$97,878 \$96,388 \$90,376	1 2 3 4
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D Univ. of Calif.	I I I I	Number 638 512 548 386 3,652	\$124,260 \$115,966 \$112,349 \$111,897 \$103,099	1 2 3 4	Number 113 136 175 81 1,228	\$10,524 \$78,833 \$75,019 \$66,810 \$68,758	3 1 2 7 5	Number 218 200 166 180 938	\$65,691 \$64,524 \$66,226 \$54,830 \$59,991	2 3 1 6	Number 969 848 889 647 5,818	\$104,817 \$97,878 \$96,388 \$90,376 \$88,898	1 2 3 4 5
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D Univ. of Calif. Institution E	I I I I P P	Number 638 512 548 386 3,652	\$124,260 \$115,966 \$112,349 \$111,897 <b>\$103,099</b> \$97,100	1 2 3 4 5	Number 113 136 175 81 1,228	\$10,524 \$78,833 \$75,019 \$66,810 \$68,758 \$70,337	3 1 2 7 5	Number 218 200 166 180 938 415	\$65,691 \$64,524 \$66,226 \$54,830 <b>\$59,991</b>	2 3 1 6 <b>4</b> 5	Number 969 848 889 647 <b>5,818</b>	\$alary \$104,817 \$97,878 \$96,388 \$90,376 \$88,898 \$78,823	1 2 3 4 5
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D Univ. of Calif. Institution E Institution B	I I I I P P P	Number 638 512 548 386 3,652 693 435	\$124,260 \$115,966 \$112,349 \$111,897 <b>\$103,099</b> \$97,100 \$97,011	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Number 113 136 175 81 1,228 364 257	\$10,524 \$78,833 \$75,019 \$66,810 \$68,758 \$70,337 \$67,486	3 1 2 7 5 4 6	Number 218 200 166 180 938 415 217	\$65,691 \$64,524 \$66,226 \$54,830 \$59,991 \$55,745 \$54,233	2 3 1 6 4 5 7	Number 969 848 889 647 5,818 1,472 909	\$104,817 \$97,878 \$96,388 \$90,376 \$88,898 \$78,823 \$78,435	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<sup>1.</sup> I =Independent; P = Public.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

<sup>2.</sup> Estimated data.